



Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Project
An Urgent Need, A Unique Opportunity
Leadership Group Meeting Summary
June 18th, 2002, 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.
Town Hall, 1119 8th Avenue

Introductions and Meeting Objectives

Pat Serie welcomed the Leadership Group members and guests and reviewed the evening's objectives, which were to update the group on the current plans, review the estimated cost ranges generated as a result of the Cost Estimation Validation Process, and introduce the concept of phasing for each of the plans.

Introductory Remarks

Tim Ceis, Deputy Mayor of Seattle, welcomed the group and reviewed the information to be presented throughout the course of the evening. Tim stated the need to talk about phasing and costs of the plans in order to come up with a solution that can be built and funded. But first, the Mayor wants to talk about the broader vision of what replaces the viaduct, not only the structure, but also how it connects in the north and the south and the new opportunities created in those areas.

Washington Secretary of Transportation Doug MacDonald thanked the Leadership Group members for coming and following the process because their input is critical to the project. The project is about vision and the project needs the Leadership Group's vision. There are more projects than the State has money so the question is how is the vision reconciled with the plans of how the project is built. Much of the work the consultants have performed since the last meeting is to refine the alignments. The CEVP exercise that the team went through was enlightening and the results of that process will be shared tonight. Doug emphasized that the public that is ready to move forward and that is why the Leadership Group's input is so important.

Update on Design Plans

Maureen Sullivan, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Project Director, began by telling the group that much has happened since the last meeting in February—seawall investigations, CEVP, development of phasing options, and geotechnical explorations along the corridor. The team has had several dozen community meetings and met with hundreds of people, completed traffic studies and continued to develop urban design concepts. The team will be coming back to the Leadership Group in July with more information on the urban design opportunities presented by the project. The team has also completed tolling studies and will share the results later in the meeting.

Tom Madden, WSDOT Engineering Manager, reviewed the designs plans and the changes made since the last meeting. Those changes were described as:

- Plan A -- Eliminated eastern alignment (running down Utah) in south and replaced with aerial in current SR 99 alignment
- Plan B - Replaced cut and cover tunnel south of King Street with aerial facility over Royal Brougham and Atlantic
- Plan C - Replaced single large tunnel with twin-bored tunnels under Belltown area; moved north portal to Roy Street
- Plan D - Replaced tunnel south of King Street with aerial facility over Royal Brougham and Atlantic and replaced mined tunnel under Seattle Center with cut-and-cover tunnel under Broad Street.
- Rebuild - Retrofit option has become a rebuild due to the amount of aerial structure that would actually have to be replaced. Recent investigations have shown that only about 20 feet through the center of the existing viaduct would be worth salvaging.

Bob Chandler, City of Seattle Project Manager, briefed the group on the condition of the seawall. Bob displayed a piece of seawall that had been eaten away by gribbles and stated that the seawall is still being damaged by the marine bugs. The team is finding more damage than anticipated. Marine borers have caused extensive damage to both the relieving platform as well as the supporting piles. What has been discovered through studies over the last nine months is that there is not much that is salvageable; the retrofit option for the seawall has also now become a rebuild option.

Tom and Bob explained in Plan C or D the north portal of the tunnel can remain where it currently is north of Denny or be placed further north. Portaling at Roy Street would allow for many streets in the lower Queen Anne area and in the Mercer corridor to be reconnected over SR 99. This north portal at Roy Street has to be part of Plan D for technical reasons, but it opens the door to extending the portal further north with the other plans as well.

Questions and comments about the plans and seawall included:

- In regards to the seawall, is the project just focusing on the deck or are the supporting piles that go all the way down to the ground also included? Bob answered that the team is finding substantial damage in the relieving platform and the piles.
- Is it possible to construct a cut-and-cover tunnel so close to the Pacific Science Center?
- Does the soil have to be stabilized in the rebuild plan?
- What are the pros and cons between C and D in the north?
- How are the options in the north end being combined or integrated with other transportation modes, i.e., buses?

Design Plan Cost Ranges and Potential Funding Sources

David Dye, WSDOT Urban Corridors Office Director, and John Reilly, John Reilly Associates International, provided an overview of the Cost Estimate Validation Process (CEVP). John told the group that cost is not a single number. If a single number is talked about, it masks the critical risks and variations of the different parts of the project that can significantly affect cost. Scope underestimates impacts and schedule. John reviewed large projects across the country that have run over budget and by how much. Nationally and internationally large projects experience cost overruns due to:

- Owner expertise
- Stakeholder issues
- Inability to forecast
- Estimates in today's dollars

David told the group that WSDOT needed to provide up-to-date cost information for those who are trying to make regional transportation decisions. It is important that the public knows how much the projects are going to cost in total. David then updated the group on what has been done since February, reviewed the projects that went through the CEVP process and listed the respective ranges in estimated costs. He stated that because these projects cost so much and all of the money will not be available at once, phasing of the overall vision becomes an important issue. Some key points that are true for the costs being presented for WSDOT's projects are:

- Cost estimates are stated in dollar ranges, not as single number
- Cost ranges are not a warranty
- Construction schedules and year of expenditure drive cost estimate ranges
- Level of design varies
- Definition and phasing decisions pending
- All projects have risks!

Maureen reviewed key points specific to the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Project costs, including:

- There are significant cost ranges and variability, depending on each option
- Risk issues include contaminated soil and soil conditions

- All plans address seismic vulnerability of existing viaduct and seawall and include safety improvements
- Construction occurs in a dense urban environment complex
- Phasing is possible, but difficult

Maureen stated that it was a very intensive effort going through the CEVP process, but the team learned a great deal by doing it. The range of the costs depends largely on the risks and there are some risks in common to all of the plans. For example, the national seismic standards are continually changing and the team incorporated an estimate anticipating those changes. The cost estimate ranges for the plans being considered by the project today are as follows:

Rebuild	\$3.2-3.5B
Plan A	\$5.7-6.4B
Plan B	\$7.8-8.9B
Plan C	\$10.1-11.6B
Plan D	\$8.8-10.3B

The State funding package on the ballot this fall includes \$450 million for the Alaskan Way Viaduct. A potential regional funding package is still being developed

Grace Crunican, Seattle Department of Transportation Director, presented to the group options for finding additional funding for the project for both design and construction efforts. The City, along with other jurisdictions (the Port, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, etc.) will be likely to participate in the funding scheme. The City is looking at the project as more than just a structures project and more than just a seawall project. For example, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has a program that the project could qualify for because of the seawall and that could potentially match funds provided by the City or WSDOT.

Financing the project is challenging, but there are financing model examples to look at in Los Angeles and Long Beach and there is also a program (TIFIA) which loans money at very low interest for projects similar to the viaduct. The City and WSDOT are trying to tap into as many sources as possible and the full funding package will be a combination of those sources. Time is money and we need to stress the decision making process as a money saver. The sooner a decision is made and the project can move forward, the better.

Potential Opportunities for Phasing

Maureen introduced the group to the concept of phasing and what that means for this project. As the team looked at the costs of the plans it was clear that not all of the money will be available at one time and all of the plans will have to be phased. The guiding principles for how the plans would be phased include addressing the portion at greatest risk first and providing a usable facility that works with the overall vision.

Karl Winterstein, Parsons Brinckerhoff Project Manager, walked through the options for phasing each of the plans. He stated that phasing is difficult, but is possible. It is a very dynamic process and the team is constantly reviewing how and when things can be done. In advance of the first phase for any of the plans, there is significant relocation of utilities required.

Questions and comments regarding phasing included:

- How would traffic operate in Plan B?
- Are there plans to demolish the viaduct in the first phase?
- Where would a temporary aerial structure be built in Plan A?
- What is the difference between the first phase Plan D versus first phase Plan C alignment?
- How does do the first phases affect speed reduction and safety?
- Can the difference in costs and travel time between A, B, C, D for the phasing options be explained?

- If funding is received for the first phase, but no more funding becomes available, what happens to the project and the future phases?

Doug MacDonald closed the phasing presentation by adding that if the team phases the project similar to the options presented above, this project will be completed. It is more a question of how to start and commit to the vision. There are benefits to the first phase even if funding does not become available for future phases.

Feedback

- On the south end in Plan A, there is an aerial structure to Spokane St. What is the possibility of moving E. Marginal Way underneath the viaduct? Has that been looked at? Where E. Marginal is today, there are railroad tracks. As the Port continues to look at what they want to do with Terminal 46, can the street be relocated to use that more space along the waterfront?
- There needs to be more of an effort made to develop a southern terminus of the cut-and-cover tunnel. The design team should strive to make S. King St. more pedestrian friendly.
- What are the impacts of the plans? Are there rankings that indicate which would be least disruptive to traffic and businesses?
- The mega-projects should be ranked by benefits, costs, and safety. This would show the Alaskan Way Viaduct as the most important mega-project to the state from both technical and cost perspectives. We need a mechanism for looking at each of these plans, criteria, and costs and comparing them.
- Plan A does not provide for increased mobility or open space and separates Plan A from the other alternatives
- It will be helpful if the public could see a map that shows all of the different projects in one place.
- If there was no environmental process and the project does not commit to maintaining traffic, how long would it take to build a replacement?

Pat asked the group to send in additional thoughts on which plan is preferred and why.

Closing Remarks

Doug MacDonald closed the meeting by asking Leadership Group members to think about what it would be like to go without the viaduct for several years. The strain on the Port and other waterfront activities would hurt the economy. Travel to and from West Seattle when the viaduct was closed following the Nisqually Earthquake took three hours. Also, if the viaduct is not usable, the impact on I-5 will be tremendous. These risks are clear to members of the Leadership Group, but not as clear to the public.

The project team is conducting a study to determine if tolling is a feasible alternative for the viaduct. Preliminary findings show that it will generate revenues, but far less than expected. The study assumes full electronic tolling where users of the facility would be using a transponder and billed electronically. The problem is that there are other corridors to move north and south so users may try to circumvent the toll. The study also shows that people may choose to use other modes of transportation.

Maureen reviewed upcoming events, including the next meeting, July 23rd, and thanked the Leadership Group members in attendance for their participation.

Leadership Group Members Present:

Name	Affiliation
Bruce Agnew	Cascadia Discovery Institute
Tim Ceis	Deputy Mayor of Seattle
Frank Chopp	Washington House of Representatives
Peter Coates	SBT
John Coney	Queen Anne Neighborhood Representative
Richard Conlin	Seattle City Council
Steve Erickson	Magnolia Neighborhood Representative
Dave Gering	Manufacturing and Industrial Council

Tom Graff	Downtown District Council
Joel Horn	Elevated Transit Company
Peter Hurley	Transportation Choices Coalition
Stephanie Bowman for Steve Leahy	Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce
Stephen Lundgren	Ballard Neighborhood Representative
Doug MacDonald	Secretary of Transportation
Dan Mathis	FHWA
Mary McCumber	Puget Sound Regional Council
Ed Murray	Washington State House of Representatives
John Musgrave	West Seattle Neighborhood Representative
Connie Niva	Washington State Transportation Commissioner
Pati Otley	BNSF
Ralph Pease	Argosy Cruises
Neil Peterson	FlexCar
Ron Posthuma	King County DOT
Margarita Prentice	Washington State Senate
Don Royse	Seattle Design Commission
Judy Runstad	Foster Pepper Shefelman
Tom Tierney	Port of Seattle
Paul Tomita	Seattle Planning Commissioner
Herald Ugles	ILWO
Steve Williamson	King County Labor Council
Jim Young	Seattle Steam Company/Downtown Seattle Association

Leadership Group Members not Present:

Name	Affiliation
Tim Botkin	Kitsap County
Lee Copeland	Weinstein Copeland Architects
Joni Earl	Sound Transit
Christine Endresen	Kitsap County
Dan Evans	Daniel J. Evans and Associates
David Goodyear	TY Lin
Jerry Grinstein	Madrona Investments
Fred Jarrett	Washington State House of Representatives
Paige Miller	Port of Seattle Commission
Greg Nickels	Mayor of Seattle
Jane Nishita	Qwest
Erik Poulsen	Washington State Senate
Charles Roeder	University of Washington
Harold Taniguchi	King County
Mike Thorne	Washington State Ferries
Doug Vann	Pioneer Square Neighborhood Representative

Guests and Project Team Attendees:

Name	Affiliation
Gordon Clarke	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Mike Rigsby	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Jared Smith	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Robert Spillar	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Jeanine Viscount	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Karl Winterstein	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Bill Conner	Parsons Brinckerhoff
David Allen	SDOT

Bob Chandler	SDOT
Grace Crunican	SDOT
Anne Fiske-Zuniga	SDOT
Richard Miller	SDOT
Liz Rankin	SDOT
Kristen Simpson	SDOT
Steve Pearce	SDOT
Susan Crowley	City of Seattle
Alec Fiskien	City of Seattle
David Dye	WSDOT
Rick Ellis	WSDOT
Carol Hunter	WSDOT
Tom Madden	WSDOT
Stephanie Miller	WSDOT
Renee Montgelas	WSDOT
John Okamoto	WSDOT
Maureen Sullivan	WSDOT
Brooke Belman	EnviroIssues
Amy Grotefendt	EnviroIssues
Migee Han	EnviroIssues
Pat Serie	EnviroIssues
Paul Bott	Jacobs Civil
Gil Salazar	Jacobs Civil
Geri Beardsley	City Council Legislative Staff
Ben Noble	City Council Legislative Staff
Brad Jurkovich	Frank Chopp's Office
Karen Daubert	Seattle Parks Foundation
Mary Fleckenstein	Washington State House of Representatives
Jean Godden	Seattle Times
Megan Kagel	Seattle Art Museum
Rob Ketcherside	Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board
Doug Myhre	ASCE
Harvey Parker	Harvey Parker and Associates
Geri Poor	Port of Seattle
Jon Runstad	Wright Runstad
Brian Steinburg	Action Better City
Melissa Trujillo	Associated Press
Tracie Wilhelm	Vulcan
David Yeaworth	Allied Arts